



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,210	03/30/2001	Hikaru Kuki	TAL/7146.074	6059

7590

07/27/2005

Timothy A. Long
Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP
1600 ODS Tower
601 S.W. Second Avenue
Portland, OR 97204-3157

EXAMINER

COFFY, EMMANUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,210

Applicant(s)

KUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Emmanuel Coffy

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 47-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 47-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 1st, 2005. Claims 47-91 directed to a web browser and method for "Selective Synchronization of Web Browsers" are pending. Claims 1-46 are canceled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the submitted Declaration. The aforementioned objection is hereby withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 47-91 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

DUPLICATE CLAIMS WARNING

4. Applicant is advised that should claims 53, 67, 72, 74 be found allowable, claims 79, 76, 89, 83 and 80 and any other claims that are deemed duplicate will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being substantial duplicates thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 77 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the claimed invention. A reasonable artisan skilled in the art could not comprehend the claims as written. The claims recite: "... including a property..." property is undefined within the claim language. It is not clear what the boundary of the claim is. Hence, the scope of the claim is unascertainable.

However, in order to expedite a more complete examination the Examiner asserts that this limitation is understood as: "location."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin et al. (US 6,240,444) in view of Jolissaint et al (US 6,463,149).

Fin teaches a web browser and browser method permit the display of web pages and dynamic effects related to displayed objects to be selectively synchronized for a plurality of browsers. (See abstract).

Claim 47:

Referring to claim 47, Fin teaches a web browser comprising:

(a) an interface to display a shared input object and detect an input related to said input object; (See fig. 5A) (Web browser window)

(b) an event manager to register an association of said shared input object and an event including at least one location attribute said location attribute comprising at least one of: (See col. 5, lines 29-36; col. 6, lines 42-45, 54-65).

(i) a function conditioning the occurrence of said event on the location of said input; and

(ii) a function limiting the location or location at which said event is to be presented;

(c) a layout engine to generate said event in response to said detection of said input and confirmation of said association of said event and said input object; and (See col. 17, lines 10-27; col. 6, line 65 to col. 8, line 2).

(d) a synchronization manager directing notification of a remote web browser of said event in response to detection of a location attribute specifying said remote browser as said location of said occurrence. (See col. 5, lines 63 to col. 6, line 3).

Fin does not explicitly teach limitations (i) and/or (ii). However, Jolissaint explicitly teaches said limitations at col. 5, lines 45-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the Web page sharing taught by Fin with the web page synchronization system as disclosed by Jolissaint. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the

knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 48:

Referring to claim 48, Fin teaches the apparatus of claim 47 further comprising a communication manager to transmit said notification to said remote web browser in response to said direction of said synchronization manager and to receive communication from said remote web browser including a notification of a receiving apparatus as a location of an occurrence of an event. (See col. 6, lines 45-48; col. 8, lines 36-51; col. 16, lines 52-61).

Claim 49:

Referring to claim 49, Fin teaches the apparatus of claim 48 further comprising a script engine to alter a displayed object in response to an event.
(See col. 17, lines 33-42; col. 6, lines 26-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 50-53, 56-57, 59-66, 84, 86-88, 90-91 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fin et al. (US 6,240,444).

Jolissaint teaches a web page synchronization system and method. (See title).

Claim 50 (new)

A method comprising the steps of:

(a) detecting an input associated with an object in a shared display of a web browser: (See col. 5, lines 48-49 – responding to a user telephone call is equivalent to detecting an input associated with an object)

(b) detecting a location attribute associated with said object, said location attribute comprising at least one of: (See col. 5, lines 51-53.) (device icon has location attribute associated with it.)

(i) a function conditioning the occurrence of an event on the location of said input; and (See col. 5, lines 54-56.) (the icon being placed at a grid position is equivalent to conditioning the occurrence of an event on the location.)

(ii) a function limiting the location at which an event is to be

presented; and (See col. 5, lines 54-56.) (the icon being placed at a grid position limits the location at which the event of placing the icon is to be presented.)

(c) producing an effect based on said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 54-56.)
(the effect is to perform automated call processing.)

Claim 51(new):

The method of claim 50 where said location attribute comprises a function conditioning the occurrence of an event on the location of said input. (See col. 5, lines 54-56.) (the icon being placed at a grid position is equivalent to conditioning the occurrence of an event on the location.)

Claim 52 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said location attribute comprises a function limiting the location at which an event is to be presented. (See col. 5, lines 54-56.) (the icon being placed at a grid position limits the location at which the event of placing the icon is to be presented.)

Claim 53 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect comprises loading a web page on a web browser specified by said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 57-62.)

Claim 56 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect dynamically alters said object. (See col. 5, lines 45-65.)

Claim 57(new):

The method of claim 56 where said object is dynamically altered on the display of at least one of a web browser at which said input was detected and another web browser. (See col. 5, lines 45-65.)

Claim 59 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect comprises loading a web page in a frame specified by said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 55-60.)

Claim 60 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect comprises loading said web page in a frame displayed by at least one of a web browser on which said input was detected and another web browser. (See col. 7, claim 1.)

Claim 61(new):

The method of claim 60 where said web browser at which said input was detected and said another web browser are engaged in a synchronized display session. (See col. 5, line 60 and col. 7, claim 1.)

Claim 62 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect is displayed on at least one web browser of a plurality of synchronized web browsers, said at least one web browser identified by said location attribute. (See col. 5, line 60 and col. 7, claim 1.)

Claim 63 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect is produced in a frame of a web browser display specified by said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 64 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect is produced in response to an input at a web browser specified by said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 65 (new):

The method of claim 50 further comprising the step of generating an event in response to said input, said event producing at least one other said location attribute associated with at least one of said object and one or more other object. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 66 (new):

The method of claim 50 further comprising the steps of:

(a) registering an association of said effect and said object associated with said input; and (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

b) in response to said input, confirming said association of said object and said event.

(See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 84 (new):

A method comprising the steps of:

(a) detecting an input at a local web browser; (See col. 5, lines 48-49 – responding to a user telephone call is equivalent to detecting an input associated with an object)

(b) generating an event in response to said input; (See col. 5, lines 51-53.)
(device icon has location attribute associated with it.)

(c) detecting at least one location attribute associated with said event, said

location attribute comprising at least one of: (See col. 5, lines 51-53.) (device icon has location attribute associated with it.)

(i) a function conditioning the occurrence of an action manipulating a shared object on the location of said input; and(See col. 5, lines 54-56.)

(the icon being placed at a grid position is equivalent to conditioning the occurrence of an event on the location.)

(ii) a function limiting the location at which an action manipulating a shared object is to be presented; and (See col. 5, lines 54-56.) (the icon being placed at a grid position limits the location at which the event of placing the icon is to be presented.)

(d) executing said action to manipulate said shared object based on said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 54-56.) (the effect is to perform automated call processing.)

Claim 86 (new):

The method of claim 85 where said action is executed in a frame displayed by at least one of said local and said remote web browsers. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 87(new):

The method of claim 84 where the step of generating an event in response to said input comprises the steps of:

(a) registering an association of said event and an input object; (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

(b) detecting said input at a display location corresponding to said input object; and

(See col. 5, lines 48-49

Art Unit: 2157

(c) confirming said association in response to said input; and (See col. 5, lines 48-49

(d) generating said event in response to said confirmation. (See col. 5, lines 48-49

Claim 88 (new):

The method of claim 84 where said location attribute specifies a source for said user input, said method further comprising the step of confirming that said source of said user input is a browser including a location equivalent to said source specified by said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 90 (new):

The method of claim 89 further comprising the step of manipulating said object in a frame displayed by said remote web browser in response to detection of a location attribute of said event specifying a frame displayed by said remote browser. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 91(new):

The method of claim 90 wherein said action comprises loading a web page. (See col. 5, lines 55-60.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2157

11. Claims 54, 55, 58, 67-83, 85, 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jolissaint et al (US 6,463,149 in view of Anupam et al. (US 6,353,851).

Jolissaint teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a web page synchronization system and method. (See title).

Claim 54 (new):

The method of claim 50 where said effect comprises loading a web page on at least one of a web browser at which said input was detected and another web browser.

Jolissaint teaches producing an effect based on said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 54-56) but does not specifically teach loading a web page on at least one of a web browser at which said input was detected and another web browser. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 21, lines 9-17. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page synchronization system as disclosed by Jolissaint with the Web page sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 55 (new):

The method of claim 54 where said web browser at which said input was detected and said another web browser are engaged in a synchronized display session. (See col. 5, lines 55-65.)

Claim 58 (new):

The method of claim 57 where said web browser at which said input was detected and said another web browser are engaged in a synchronized display session.

Jolissaint teaches detecting an input associated with an object in a shared display of a web browser: (See col. 5, lines 48-49 but does not specifically teach two web browsers engaged in a synchronized display session. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 2, lines 58-62. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the Web page synchronization taught by Jolissaint with the web sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 67(new):

The method of claim 50 further comprising the steps of:

- (a) sending a synchronization command from a first web browser to a second web browser in response to detection of said location attribute specifying said second web browser as said location for said effect; and
- (b) producing said effect at said second browser in response to said synchronization command.

Jolissaint teaches producing an effect based on said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 54-56) but does not specifically the limitations of above claim. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 2, lines 57-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page synchronization system as disclosed by Jolissaint with the Web page sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 68 (new):

The method of claim 67 where said step of producing said effect comprises the step of loading a web page on a remote web browser. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 69 (new): The method of claim 68 further comprising the step of loading said web page on a local web browser at which said input was detected. (See col. 5, lines 13-60.)

Claim 70 (new):

The method of claim 69 wherein said remote web browser and said local web browser are engaged in a synchronized display session.

Jolissaint teaches detecting an input associated with an object in a shared display of a web browser: (See col. 5, lines 48-49 but does not specifically teach two web browsers engaged in a synchronized display session. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 2, lines 58-62. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the Web page synchronization taught by Jolissaint with the web sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 71 (new):

The method of claim 67 where said step of producing said effect comprises the step of dynamically altering said object as displayed by a remote web browser. (See col. 5, lines 45-65.)

Claim 72 (new):

The method of claim 67 further comprising the step of dynamically altering said

Art Unit: 2157

object as displayed on a local web browser at which said input was detected. (See col. 5, lines 45-65.)

Claim 73 (new):

The method of claim 72 where said remote web browser and said local web browser are engaged in a synchronized display session.

Jolissaint teaches detecting an input associated with an object in a shared display of a web browser: (See col. 5, lines 48-49 but does not specifically teach two web browsers engaged in a synchronized display session. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 2, lines 58-62. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the Web page synchronization taught by Jolissaint with the web sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 74 (new):

The method of claim 67 where said effect comprises loading a web page in a frame specified by said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 55-60.)

Claim 75 (new):

The method of claim 74 where said frame is displayed by said first web browser. (See col. 5, lines 45-60.)

Claim 76 (new):

The method of claim 50 further comprising the steps of:

- (a) sending a synchronization command from a first web browser to a second web browser in response to detection of said location attribute specifying said first web browser as a location for said input; and
- (b) producing said effect on at least one of said first and said second web browsers.

Jolissaint teaches producing an effect based on said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 54-56) but does not specifically the limitations of above claim. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 2, lines 57-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page synchronization system as disclosed by Jolissaint with the Web page sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 77(new):

The method of claim 76 wherein said step of sending said synchronization command from said first web browser to said second web browser comprises the steps of:

- (a) detecting said location attribute specifying a location of a source of said input;
- (b) confirming that said property of said web browser at which said input was detected conforms to said property specified by said location attribute; and
- (c) sending said synchronization command to said second web browser in response to said confirmation.

Jolissaint teaches detecting said location attribute specifying a location. (See col. 5, lines 51-53) but does not specifically the limitations of above claim. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 2, lines 57-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page synchronization system as disclosed by Jolissaint with the Web page sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 78 (new):

The method of claim 77 further comprising the step of loading a web page at second web browser in response to said synchronization command. (See col. 5, lines 13-60.)

Claim 79 (new):

The method of claim 78 further comprising the step of loading a web page at said first web browser in response to said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 57-62.)

Claim 80 (new):

The method of claim 79 further comprising the step of loading a web page in a frame displayed by said first web browser in response to said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 55-60.)

Claim 81 (new):

The method of claim 77 further comprising the step of loading a web page in a frame displayed by said second web browser in response to said synchronization command. (See col. 5, line 60 and col. 7, claim 1.)

Claim 82 (new):

The method of claim 77 further comprising dynamically altering an object displayed by said second web browser in response to said synchronization command. (See col. 5, lines 45-65.)

Claim 83 (new):

The method of claim 82 further comprising the step of dynamically altering an object displayed by said first web browser in response to said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 45-65.)

Claim 85 (new):

The method of claim 84 where said action is executed at one or more of said local web browser and at least one remote web browser.

Jolissaint teaches producing an effect based on said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 54-56) but does not specifically teach loading a web page on at least one of a web browser at which said input was detected and another web browser. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 21, lines 9-17. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page synchronization system as disclosed by Jolissaint with the Web page sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

Claim 89 (new):

The method of claim 84 wherein the step executing said action to manipulate said shared object based on said location attribute comprises the step of:

(a) sending a synchronization command from a local web browser to a remote web browser in response to detection of a location attribute specifying said remote web browser as said location for said action; and

Art Unit: 2157

(b) executing said action to manipulate said object at said remote web browser in response to said synchronization command.

Jolissaint teaches producing an effect based on said location attribute. (See col. 5, lines 54-56) but does not specifically the limitations of above claim. However, Anupam explicitly discloses such limitation at col. 2, lines 57-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page synchronization system as disclosed by Jolissaint with the Web page sharing taught by Anupam. Motivation, in this case, comes not from the reference itself but from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. One would have recognized that in a business, educational, or other controlled environment wherein a large number of users continually utilize collaborative browsing software, it would have been advantageous to integrate the surrogate into the browser to significantly reduce the load placed on the server. Users would then have immediate and seamless access to the collaborative browsing features.

12. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Coffy whose telephone number is (571) 272-3997. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-3997. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Emmanuel Coffy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

EC

July 12, 2005


A. Salas
7/24/05